

**Amendment/Response**

**Reply to Office Action of February 12, 2004**

**REMARKS/DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 are pending in this application, with claims 5-8 being cancelled and claims 1 and 9 being amended.

A provisional election without traverse was made on February 4, 2004 to prosecute the invention of Group I, to wit, claims 1-4 and 9-13. This election is confirmed and non-elected claims 5-8 are cancelled.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1 and 9-10 are rejected under U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Palagonia, U.S. Patent No. 5,751,057. Claims 1 and 9 are amended or cancelled to overcome the rejection.

For a reference to anticipate an invention, the reference must disclose every component of the invention. MPEP § 2131. In other words, in order to avoid rejection for anticipation, it is only necessary to show that a claim contains at least one element not disclosed in a single prior art reference.

Claims 1 and 9 are amended to specify that the two groups of leads are non-overlapping leads, unlike the leads disclosed in Palagonia. The combination of features recited in claims 1 and 9, specifically that the leads be parallel and that they be non-overlapping, is thought to clearly distinguish the present invention from that disclosed in Palagonia. In Palagonia, one set of leads begins parallel to the second set of leads, but then has a branch that is perpendicular to the second set of leads, completely unlike the present invention as claimed in claims 1 and 9. Claim 10, being dependent upon and further limiting claim 9, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations it contains.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 and 9-10 under U.S.C. § 102(b) is therefore respectfully requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-4 and 10-13 are rejected under U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Palagonia (U.S. Pat. No. 5,751,057) in view of Yagi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,201,292). The rejection of the claims, as amended, is respectfully traversed.

Amendment/Response

Reply to Office Action of February 12, 2004

Claims 2-4 and 10-13, being dependent upon and further defining independent claims 1 and 9, respectively, should be allowable for that reason, as well as for the additional recitations they contain. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2-4 and 10-13 under U.S.C. § 103 is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Christopher R. Pastel, Reg. No. 37,694  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

HANCOCK & ESTABROOK, LLP  
1500 MONY Tower I  
P.O. Box 4976  
Syracuse, New York 13221-4976  
Telephone: (315) 471-3151